

Alan Watt
"Cutting Through The Matrix" Live On RBN (#276)

Poem Copyright Alan Watt Mar. 13, 2009:

The UN's 'New and Improved' (Privatized) Sovietized Politburo:

**"The World's on the Move with the UN Gangsters,
Creating a Politburo for the Global Banksters,
With International Businesses' CEOs
For the Nanny-State World, Run by NGOs,
They'll All be There Running the United Nations,
Writing Miles of Rules for the Populations,
'Governanced' by Those Who Rule the Market,
Under the Guise of Altruism, Their Demo-racket,
'Cause We Can't Elect Them, Control Freaks, Driven
By Sado-masochistic Tendencies, Abhor Criticism,
'We're Only Cruel to be Kind,' the Deviants Say,
God Help Us All if They have Their Way"**

© Alan Watt Mar. 13, 2009

Friday 13th March 2009

Poem & Dialogue Copyrighted Alan Watt - Mar. 13, 2009 (Exempting Music,
Literary Quotes, and Callers' Comments)

www.cuttingthroughthematrix.com

www.alanwattsentientsentinel.eu

"Code of Silence" by Bruce Springsteen

There's a code of silence that we don't dare speak
There's a wall between us and a river so deep
And we keep pretending that there's nothing wrong
But there's a code of silence and it can't go on

Hi folks, I am Alan Watt and this is Cutting Through The Matrix on March the 13th 2009.

I always advise newcomers to look into www.cuttingthroughthematrix.com that's my website; and you can download to your heart's content hundreds of hours of talks I've given in the past, where I try to at least fill in a lot of the blanks of the big picture in history, leading up to the present time. And I try and show you how it's all put together, how big forces, big rich forces, all working in collusion, are guiding the destiny of the planet into the unfortunate outcome at the end, if they get their way (and it truly will be unfortunate). They want to plan a new kind of society and even a new kind of servant, to serve the masters at the top, those who have evolved more than the rest, apparently, according to their own literature.

Also, look into www.alanwattsentientsentinel.eu for transcripts of these talks, which you can download; they're written in the various languages of Europe; print up and pass around to your friends.

You can also help to keep me going, buying what's on the website at www.cuttingthroughthematrix.com or donating to me as well: there's a button on the website for that. That keeps things ticking over - and they just keep tick over indeed - sometimes they miss a tick or two.

We are bombarded by news / mainstream media. Much of it is trivia; a lot of it is repetition. They've even had programmes on news about the fact that they will rehash the same kind of stories years after events and so on, when they run out of material or trivial material to pass onto the public. And that gets me back to what big players have said in the past, the type of society they would give us, at this time. They wrote these articles 50 years ago, 60 years ago. Bertrand Russell said that the public would be fed trivia, entertainment and trivia; and it works very well on the general public. You have a sex scandal and the whole world's talking about it; or, someone in Hollywood, with a little scandal and the whole world's talking about this one little person. Out of billions of people on the planet, they can get everybody prattling on about one little person that's totally irrelevant to anything, while your rights and your freedoms - and maybe even your very lives - are being taken away from you. It's astonishing how this works; it's an old art, very old. I keep saying that Plato talked about it, in the Republic and other writings of his; and how they understood it thousands of years ago, how to divert the general population and give them trivia, which a lot of them are very happy with, very-very happy with. It's interesting too that the billions of people on the planet, all, at some time in their life, will have sexual relations. Billions, everybody, ants, bees, insects, everything does this but they can focus us all on one little couple, or one little person in Hollywood, as though it was something incredible unique. That's all it takes and you wonder why they despise the people at the bottom? Those at the top; you wonder why they despise them, do you really wonder?

We're on a roll now, everything that happened was written about in science fiction years ago, which is just predictive programming, because the big sci-fi authors belong to the Futurist Society, an organisation set-up and funded by the big banking boys, this kind of foundations, where they select certain people, for their abilities, they tell them to write a story around certain little items; and this is what they call predictive programming. They talked about this next story I'm going to give you, after the break, to do with genetic manipulation and how you'll have a class society on poor and good genes.

=== BREAK ===

Hi folks, I am Alan Watt and this is Cutting Through The Matrix. Just before the break, I was mentioning how sci-fi writers are chosen, the big sci-fi writers, are chosen, to write stories in much the same way that H.G. Wells was trained and chosen for his task, as a propagandist for the Royal Institute of International Affairs and the World Society. He was given information on different sciences and he had to wrap stories around it and bring in the social implications, the fall-out of futuristic things and happenings; and after him, many-many sci-fi writers, all belonging to the Futurist Society, doing the same kind of thing. They're well-rewarded these characters, they're guaranteed to be 'hits' as well, it doesn't matter how good or bad the writing is, as long as they can weave a story around certain scientific facts, or facts yet to be disclosed to the public. It's called predictive programming and we get used to the idea, through fiction, that this will come and then, when it does come, we have no moral questions, or legal questions, about it, it just happens, it's in society and that's how things now are.

Quite a few years ago, science fiction writers were talking about the new types of genetic discrimination there would be in the future, based on your type of DNA etc, family background, history of illnesses, propensities to certain diseases and all of that kind of stuff. Of course, the mainstream media would bring these topics into question and say but 'no, no, that would never happen in a civilised society, there'd be safeguards etc to stop discrimination on your genetic heritage', and of course those who are wiser, laugh at that kind of nonsense. And here it is, this is in the Sydney Morning Herald, Business News, from Australia, from the National, it says here:

Australians refused insurance because of poor genes

By Deborah Smith, March 10, 2009

AUSTRALIANS have been refused insurance protection because of their genetic make-up, researchers have shown in the first study in the world to provide proof of genetic discrimination. Most cases were found to relate to life insurance. In one instance, a man with a faulty gene linked to a greater risk of breast and prostate cancer was denied income protection and trauma insurance that would have let him claim if he developed other forms of cancer.

I like the way they even worded it: "a man with a faulty gene linked to a greater risk". It doesn't mean he's going to get it; so, even that, in itself, is misleading. It says:

The findings have led to renewed calls by experts

Again: experts eh? Bioethicists / eugenicists.

for policies to ensure the appropriate use of genetic test results by the insurance industry. The director of the Centre for Genetics Education

Ha-ha.

at Royal North Shore Hospital, Kristine Barlow-Stewart, said the research also showed consumers needed to be better informed about their rights.

Really, what rights? What rights? We've as much rights against these characters, insurance companies, as you do against the bankers at the top - they're untouchable.

"Eighty-five per cent of the people in the study didn't know where to go to seek assistance if they had been discriminated against," she said. Associate Professor Barlow-Stewart and her colleagues surveyed more than 1000 people who had attended clinical genetic services about their experiences of discrimination.

In a long, complex process that was only possible because of the assistance of organisations and companies that had carried out the discrimination, the researchers were able to verify 11 cases of genetic discrimination, and their results are published in the journal Genetics in Medicine.

"Previous to this paper, only anecdotal reports of genetic discrimination have been available, with some commentators questioning whether or not the phenomenon actually existed,"

Well, of course, they'd pooh-pooh it.

Professor Barlow-Stewart said. In one case, two women with the same genetic fault linked to breast cancer

I like how they put it to a genetic "fault". None of this is definitely sure, in science, it's always maybes, but even this article here is reaffirming the agenda.

the same genetic fault linked to breast cancer applied for income protection to the same insurer three years apart. One was denied any type of cover, while the other was offered insurance with an exclusion of breast cancer. The different decisions were justified by the Insurance and Financial Services Association on the grounds of updated scientific information. "But I don't believe consumers should be penalised while the insurance companies are learning,"

Learning? They're just making money hand-over-fist. I added the last part; Professor Barlow-Stewart didn't say that.

An expert assessment panel should be established to advise on which tests are sufficiently well understood to be used for insurance purposes, she said.

There's always things that should be done but never are, eh?

This was one of the recommendations of a 2003 report by the Australian Law Reform Commission. "And it still hasn't happened."

Well, that's exactly what I've just been saying and it won't either. You see, insurance is the biggest con, apart from banking, it's really one and the same thing; and insurance companies loan out more money for big building projects than the banks do these days. They want it all for nothing; they hope you just drop dead of something else that's not in a clause somewhere. And people who go into this insurance scam, I shake my head, you know, you're born to take your chances, you're born to take your chances on this planet; and what a con to think that money and insurance is somehow going to make it better for you. Take your chances and don't give these sharks a cent. It says:

It is only legal for companies to use this information if they can justify their decisions.

And on and on it goes, so now they have this to do with genetic discrimination. Now, I've gone through the history of the Eugenics Societies and how the big Carnegie Foundation, Rockefeller Foundation and others set up the Cold Springs Harbour for genetic research. They were the ones who brought in the Census, the national Census, in the US. The British counterparts working for the Darwin family, who set up their own eugenics experimentation foundation, they did it in Britain, for the Census. Since then, and it tells you right in their own records, the purpose was not to find out how many people lived in the country, the purpose was to find the genetic and hereditary problems, within families and their offspring, to trace them down through the generations. That was the primary purpose of the Census report; that was it. Secondly, it was for taxation purposes: counting heads; that's what it was done for. Eugenics, eugenics, eugenics, I keep hammering at that; and until people get it through their heads, we're going down a slippery slope, because these guys at the top meant business a hundred years ago and they mean more business today, believe you me.

The UK is famous for being the gentleman, they have this myth that's been around the world that, in war-time and so on, they're good sportsmen; once their enemy's down, they'll put their hand out, they'll extend the hand to help them up; but it's all P.R. Britain has been the most ruthless exploiter of countries across the planet, for a long-long time. I should say London, because it's London that rules the country and a good part of the world. And it's the same now with rendition, rendition is the term, they love these terms, rather than say kidnapping people out of the country for torture, they call it "rendition". It sounds cleaners and more hygienic; and they're always denying that they do rendition; and that is true, they get other nationalities or nationals to do it for them, so that Britain is still squeaky clean, technically. This is from the BBC, the 13th of March 2009:-

Binyam blames UK for mistreatment

A UK resident freed from Guantánamo Bay has said he would not have faced torture or extraordinary rendition but for British involvement in his case. US interrogators told him, "This is the British file and this is the American file," Binyam Mohamed, 30, told the BBC in his first broadcast interview. He said he wanted to see ex-President George Bush put on trial and, if there were evidence, former UK PM Tony Blair.

Well, he can kiss that off; you can kiss that off on your wish list for Christmas.

The UK says it does not condone torture, but will examine any claims.

As I say, they're famous for this, famous for this and I read an article about two weeks ago, where the head of MI6, again, denied they do this; but, then, someone who works there says: "yeah, we farm it out, we farm it out".

The US has dropped all charges against Mr Mohamed.

Can you imagine getting hauled off to another country, tortured and all the rest of it and they don't find anything, as usual, and there are no apologies, nothing, it's just; "oops, terribly, terribly sorry old chap".

BBC News reporter Jon Manel,

That happened in Canada too with a fellow here, an engineer; and the RCMP helped the CIA whisk him out the country.

BBC News reporter Jon Manel, who conducted the interview at a secret location, said that Mr Mohamed looked "very thin" and claimed to be suffering from health problems.

Well, no kidding.

Binyam Mohammed's Journey. Mr Mohamed, who spoke to the media against the advice of his psychiatrist because he wanted people to know what happened to him, described his return to the UK last month. "I didn't feel like I was free.

And that's what they do, when they've had you in tiny little stand-up cells and the rest of the day you're on your knees, in the sun, with your hands tied behind your back, it's called torture, you see; and you're deprived of sleep and they might pull you out and pretend to shoot you, with a blindfold on. And then you're led back in again, back and forth, back and forth, very old techniques. Once they're released,

they never really feel they're free, it's like part of their soul's been destroyed. He says:

"It's been seven years of literally darkness that I have been through.

Seven years!

Coming back to life is taking me some time." He added: "I don't have the regular person's feelings that people have.

That's true, you get *depersonalised* they call it.

The feelings of happiness and sadness, I still don't have them.

I'll be back with more - after this break.

=== BREAK ===

Hi folks, this is Alan Watt, we're Cutting Through The Matrix, getting away from the usual trivia and titillating stuff that's bombarded our ears, for years and years and years, by the media. Even an article like this, to do with this kidnapping, or rendition, as they like to call it nowadays; it's only kidnapping if you do it, it's rendition if the government does it. Even the way that it's written here, puts shame on the reporters, because you could have a far deeper investigation, as a reporter on what actually happened and they haven't, they won't do that, because, after all, the BBC wrote the story and they're part of the British Government, they get paid all their money from the tax payer, via the Government.

This particular man, Mr. Mohammed said too that:

"If it wasn't for the British involvement right at the beginning of the interrogations in Pakistan, and suggestions that were made by MI5 to the Americans of how to get me to respond, I don't think I would have gone to Morocco," he said.

That's where they kidnapped him.

"It was that initial help that MI5 gave to America that led me through the seven years of what I went through." The MI5 agent who questioned him has previously denied at the British High Court any suggestion that he threatened or put any pressure on Mr Mohamed.

Well, maybe they should have rendered the MI5 agent off, and got him to answer a few questions, in the same type of fashion? It's amazing eh? It's just amazing, they're above all morality, you see, the man couldn't lie to save his life, this MI5 agent; but, by god they love torturing other people, don't they? And, unfortunately, the world is not short of these characters, they're scumbags, dirty-dirty scumbags and they're all down through the strata of society. It reminds of the Tammany riots, New York, where the Mayor of New York said: "we can always hire half of the poor to kill the other half". Unfortunately it's true; and there's no amount of thugs can be hired by governments when they want to get tough on the public.

Here's an article that's interesting, because, if you listen to the way it's worded, it's written by someone at the United Nations, listen to the terms for nations and so on that they use. This is from, of all places, the Taipei Times. February the 21st 2006 this came out; someone sent it to me.

State sovereignty must be altered in globalized era

In the age of globalization, states should give up some sovereignty to world bodies in order to protect their own interests. By Richard Haass.

We know who that is.

For 350 years, sovereignty

It's straight out, this is a UN spokesman.

For 350 years, sovereignty -- the notion that states

That means nations, right.

are the central actors

We're all actors in the game you see.

on the world stage

There's the stage again, this is their terminology.

and that governments are essentially free to do what they want within their own territory but not within the territory of other states -- has provided the organizing principle of international relations. The time has come to rethink this notion.

The world's 190-plus states

I'll say "nations"

now co-exist with a larger number of powerful non-sovereign and at least partly (and often largely) independent actors,

And I've read articles before on this, it's to do with the society, this new world order that they're bringing in: they're going to bring in the big CEOs, from the international corporations, exactly as Professor Carroll Quigley said they were going to do, when they make the new system, the new feudal system of the world. That's what's happening right now. So they want to bring them in, it says:

independent actors, ranging from corporations to non-governmental organizations (NGOs),

That's the non-government organisations that are funded completely by big banking front foundation. It says:

from terrorist groups to drug cartels, from regional and global institutions to banks and private equity funds. The sovereign state is influenced by them (for better and for worse) as much as it is able to influence them. The near monopoly of power once enjoyed by sovereign entities is being eroded.

Because: it's meant to be, right?

As a result, new mechanisms are needed for regional and global governance that include actors other than states.

Or: "nations".

This is not to argue that Microsoft, Amnesty International, or Goldman Sachs be given seats in the UN General Assembly, but it does mean including representatives of such organizations in regional and global deliberations when they have the capacity to affect whether and how regional and global challenges are met.

In other words: it's double-speak, they are going to put these guys on the boards at the United Nations. And it says:

Less is more.

"Less is more", very Orwellian.

Moreover, states must be prepared to cede some sovereignty to world bodies if the international system is to function. This is already taking place in the trade realm.

Well, that's already done.

Governments agree to accept the rulings of the WTO because on balance they benefit from an international trading order even if a particular decision requires that they alter a practice that is their sovereign right to carry out.

No, that's not what happened at all. What happened was the World Trade Organisation was set up through GATT, the general public of every nation had no vote in it or say in it whatsoever and a gang of big international bankers said that they wanted it and they drafted it up, that's what happened. To continue here, I love how they keep brandishing democracy too, when they need to use that word. It says:

Some governments are prepared to give up elements of sovereignty to address the threat of global climate change.

Really? Have any of you been asked about that? Have you been asked about the spraying over your head?

Back with more - after this break.

=== BREAK ===

Hi folks, I am Alan Watt and we're Cutting Through The Matrix, reading an article put out by Mister Haass, the UN, talking about the need to weaken sovereignty even further. He says here:

All of this suggests that sovereignty must be redefined if states are to cope with globalization. At its core, globalization entails the increasing volume, velocity, and importance of flows -- within and across borders -- of people, ideas, greenhouse gases,

Oh!

goods, dollars, drugs, viruses, e-mails, weapons and a good deal else, challenging one of sovereignty's fundamental principles: the ability to control what crosses borders in either direction. Sovereign states increasingly measure their vulnerability not to one another, but to forces beyond their control.

Globalization thus implies that sovereignty is not only becoming weaker in reality, but that it needs to become weaker.

This is the UN's opinion; now remember, the UN is a big front organisation for the big banking boys, like Rockefeller, who set it up.

States would be wise to weaken sovereignty

Would be wise to weaken sovereignty?

in order to protect themselves,

So, weakness is strength? Very Orwellian.

because they cannot insulate themselves from what goes on elsewhere. Sovereignty is no longer a sanctuary.

We know that, because they just kidnap you now and torture you in some other country. It says:

This was demonstrated by the American and world reaction to terrorism.

Here's all the pro-Bush stuff:

Afghanistan's Taliban government, which provided access and support to al-Qaeda,

Al-Qaeda wasn't even a network; it was set up by the CIA, as people who went into an actual radio site, to listen to code words that were sent to them, by the CIA. That was in the other mainstream newspapers at the time. It says:

was removed from power. Similarly, the US' preventive war

You know, when they slaughtered and starved a million Iraqis to death.

the US' preventive war against an Iraq that ignored the UN

And the UN cannot stand being ignored you know.

and was thought to possess weapons of mass destruction showed that sovereignty no longer provides absolute protection. Imagine how the world would react if some government were known to be planning to use or transfer a nuclear device or had already done so. Many would argue -- correctly -- that sovereignty provides no protection for that state.

Then he goes on about necessity and all the rest of it and gives you the usual spiel, that's all it is: a spiel. So, they wanted to soften it and weaken your sovereignty, what you've got left of it and become completely international and let these boys at the UN, you know the ones who are very select on who they criticise for slaughtering whom. And sometimes, they're absolutely silent on people getting slaughtered, like people in Gaza. There's never a cry for getting aid out there or troops in, to stop it. Maybe the UN would get some recognition when they regard all equal life as being equal; until then, I won't bother finishing that. Astounding, it's astonishing, the hypocrisy of these characters, utter hypocrisy of them, they make you sick.

Now, yesterday, I read an article about the destruction of the family unit and again

it was from a person at the United Nations population control panel, who said was a great thing, it was a successful thing and it was the end of patriarchy, you see. Now women are free to dig up the roads and wear boots and stuff like that; and contribute to the taxes etc, etc. And how the children are having, no wonder with all the stuff they're watching on TV, they're all having children out of wed-lock, wed-lock's out the door, it's just passé now and there's orphans and all the rest of it and he says it's great, that's a good sign, it's a good sign. Well, in Britain, there's again one of these sort of trivia cases, they brought up about a young 15 year old boy who was with a girl and she was pregnant, so here's the country's answer to it, because you know the answer's got another motive here; and this is from the Mail Online 10th of March 2009:

Primary schools give sex education to children as young as FIVE after the Alfie Patten case

Schools have brought forward plans to teach five-year-olds about sex following the case of 13-year-old father Alfie Patten.

Little Alfie there has probably watched all the stuff that the adults are watching, it doesn't even have to be adult stuff anymore, it's through it all, look at Much Music. What do you think Much Music's advertising, hmm? What do you think they advertise on Much Music? What is the goal of Much Music? Apart from selling the awful stuff they call music, what do they turn women into, on Much Music, and guys too, for that matter? So, the outcome is: monkey see - monkey do; and here you go, they're getting pregnant very young. The schools, right along what Bertrand Russell said they wanted to do, is to get them active in sex, by teaching them sex education; something that wouldn't have been in their minds, at five year's old. Because Bertie Russell tried this on experimental schools, back in the 1920s. He said if we can get them into pre-pubertal sex, they'll never stay with a partner for the rest of their life, they'd be so promiscuous. So, here's the agenda:-

Schools have brought forward plans to teach five-year-olds about sex following the case of 13-year-old father Alfie Patten. Education chiefs in one city responded to the news that Alfie had fathered a child with Chantelle Stedman, 15, by deciding to start the sex lessons early. The compulsory sex education is due to be introduced in primary schools across the country

That's five year olds.

from September next year. But Leicester, which has one of the highest teenage pregnancy rates in the country, will begin the lessons this autumn. The curriculum includes teaching the difference between boys' and girls' bodies.

Like they don't know? As I say, look at Much Music, look at the cartoons they're watching. Have you ever watched the children's cartoons? Mixed in with all the environmental stuff and the greening stuff and how bad the older generations were for destroying the planet, you get all this sex as well. Anyway, there you are, there's exactly what Bertrand Russell wanted, he's got it, he's got exactly what he wanted and that is the agenda though, that's why it's happening. Nothing to do with this one case of pregnancy; and there's a big difference between five and thirteen, can any of you think what it might be?

Another story: very important. Now, when I grew up, in Britain, the government

had got the tax payers to build up the big institutes of the country, like the gas corporations, electric corporations, in other words: technically and on paper, the public owned it, right? And you put all that money and financing to set it up, iron out the problems and manage it; and as soon as they do that you see, they bring in another Party, the Conservatives, who would then privatise it all and give it to their buddies for peanuts. They'd run it into the ground, for profits, then the Labour would come back in and they'd nationalise it again and repair all the breakdowns and put new equipment in and all the rest of it and then the Conservatives would get back in again, privatise it for their buddies; and again, take all the profits out of it, without repairing it. It was like an on-going show; and I saw this in other countries as well; Canada is no different. The Prime Minister of Canada, when he was assuring the Canadians that these nuclear-powered systems in Canada, that Canada built at the time, was going to give us such cheap electricity, he even came on the television ads to tell us to keep our lights on, all night long, it would be so darn cheap. Of course, they've all been privatised, once they were up and running and we're all paying about four or five times, through the nose, what we should be.

The same thing happened in Britain. I think it was five politicians, in Britain, a few years ago, had put forward a Bill, together, to privatise the water system of Britain. It just so happened that, when they left politics, the company they formed were the ones who got the contract, the first contract for owning the water supply of Britain. I think they now call it Grid Corporation; and they're taking water from all over the planet now. One day, they will be the owners of the water for the entire planet.

Here's IBM: IBM is famous, again, it was all part of the IG Farben Group, it was the one who kept all the data in Germany, and I think the Soviet Union too, for prisoners. They used a Cardex system and a number system, to monitor you from birth to death, basically; and it's one of the big military giants, it's among the big military-industrial complex. That's why it's always been untouched. This is from the Yahoo Tech, Friday March the 13th:

IBM plans to get deep into the water business

SAN FRANCISCO - IBM Corp. is launching a new line of water services

Services? Guess who'll be serving who.

Friday, hoping to tap a new sales vein by taking the manual labor out of fighting pollution

Oh, it's for a good cause.

and managing water supplies.

They want to manage water supplies.

IBM says the overall water-management services market could be worth \$20 billion in five years.

Well, I thought they were going in because they wanted to help us fight pollution, but there's \$20 billion involved and plus.

The effort is part of a wider role IBM wants to play in infrastructure

services,

That's everything folks.

including automobile traffic and power grids.

I told you: it's part of the military-industrial complex.

In each instance, IBM is trying to persuade utilities and government agencies to overhaul their computer networks and link digital sensors together for better insights.

I should add: into their profits.

For example, instead of a meter-reader from the power company traipsing through your backyard, IBM is banking that one day your meter and your neighbors' will feed data directly into the utility's computer network.

Well, when they're saying this, they're already setting it up.

Same for water. IBM says its new services will help water providers become more efficient

It's nothing to do with the \$20 billion; it's going to make you more efficient

in overseeing ever-more-precious supplies and responding faster to contamination and other emergencies.

That's why they're doing it.

The company has been working on a project called SmartBay with an Irish marine institute to develop sensors that are monitoring pollution, marine life and wave conditions around Galway Bay and transmitting data to researchers. Among the benefits, IBM contends, is that computers can track floating debris that pose a hazard to commercial fishermen.

They're worried about hazards and pollution and stuff like that. That's why they got so stinking rich, by worrying about you.

This "smarter planet" theme is part of IBM's strategy to keep making money in the recession. The company's chairman and CEO, Sam Palmisano, said in a letter to shareholders this week that IBM will be aggressive in drumming up business in areas like managing traffic,

They want to manage all your traffic for your government.

power grids, water, food, health care and finance. He vowed the efforts will help Armonk, N.Y.-based IBM grow by getting early starts in areas that will need help for years to come. "We will not simply ride out the storm," Palmisano wrote. "Rather, we will take a long-term view, and go on offense."

So, prepare to get ripped off mightily soon, that's really what that means.

Now, another thing too is, well, actually, we should go to the calls, it's ten minutes to.

We'll take Bert from Florida there; is Bert there? Hello Bert?

Bert: Hello Alan, how are you doing?

Alan: I'm hanging in here.

Bert: I've got a question: what's wrong with Jesus Christ?

Alan: What do you mean what's wrong with him?

Bert: What's wrong with him?

Alan: Nothing's wrong.

Bert: OK. The reason I ask is: I've listened to a few of your programmes and a few things on the Internet and I always hear people who are referring to religion as kind of a duping of people.

Alan: Well, I'll keep this short, because I don't want a lecture. The fact is: institutions that are powerful, take over every religion and use it for other areas, other reasons and it's to get power, basically, it's to get power and that's why most of the people in the world get so sick, they get sick of the religion or a truth, because of the institutions that rule them, that's the problem with it, that's the problem with it. And that will continue, that will continue. I don't care what institution you've built up, if Jesus came back tomorrow, the following day, there'd be another hierarchy above it telling you new rules, new laws, new regulations and that's the way it's always been.

Bert: So, you don't believe that Jesus Christ is going to return?

Alan: That's up to you; it's up to every individual. Now, we'll go on to Derek from Philly, because I'm not going to have one of these ridiculous conversations.

Derek: Hi Alan. You can hear me?

Alan: Hello. Yes?

Derek: Well, the last caller, I would just like to say that I personally, when I was first waking-up, I became very religious and I actually got into Catholicism and I found that that was really just a, I don't even know, I don't really want to get into it; but I saw that it was all people doing everything, there's no gods involved, all people, in almost every church. Maybe there are some good churches out there but the whole idea of a church is someone else speaking for God, which is kind of an interesting idea.

Alan: What's interesting too, if you look at how many Protestant church breakaways, they're in the thousands now, as people try to break away and stick to the basic New Testament, but, before you know it, they get into an institutional frame of mind and then they go into getting, again, power-tripping and then they lose it all. Then another group splinters away, trying to keep it to the basics again and it always happens over and over, the same thing happens over and over. People will follow the group, rather than their God; that's the problem.

Derek: Well, that's an obvious point, and it's good to find out; but as well, if you, it doesn't really matter, I'll just take a different point actually. You were speaking of Bertrand Russell and you were speaking of the 5 to 13 year olds and that was really disturbing; and it seems like we do have a common enemy that everyone, no matter what you believe in, we have this enemy and he actually spoke something

which was an unveiled death threat and you actually had it in your talk.

Alan: That's right.

Derek: It was a Christmas talk, two years ago, 2007 and you spoke, you actually read excerpts from his book about, I forget the names actually, something about science.

Alan: Yes. He did say that those brighter ones amongst society, the children, that couldn't be brought in, to serve them and their purpose, but who could communicate to the public, in other words: they were intelligent etc but they could not be corrupted and brought into serve the world state, would have to be eliminated, he said.

Derek: And he actually used the term *lethal chamber*.

Alan: That's right.

Derek: So sick, I've never even heard that term before used outside of Nazis. How interesting; so, I guess I'll take it off now and talk to you soon.

Alan: Ok, thanks for calling. I'll be back, after this break.

=== BREAK ===

Hi folks, I am Alan Watt, we're Cutting Through The Matrix; and there's Nathan from New Brunswick on the line, are you there Nathan? Hello?

Nathan: Hello Alan. Hi there, I've just heard that conscription of all citizens in the United States between the ages of, if I heard it correctly, between the ages of 16 and 65, shall be mandatory for a period of three months; thank you Obama.

Alan: Well, he said that in his speeches before he went through the routine of being elected.

Nathan: Because I've never heard of such a thing and I was just speaking with a friend of mine and my friend said 'why would you think that's going to happen?' I said, well, they do have a population elimination programme in place, and what better way to do it than to have everyone conscripted and give them the good old death and vaccination programme, right?

Alan: Well, that's maybe part of it but he also said, in his campaign, that they need a civilian army, within the United States that matches its external army, to fight terrorism; so, you know the size of the US Army, he wants one bigger, a civilian army inside the US, which is bigger than the army they send abroad.

Nathan: Well, there isn't any terrorism happening anyway but I mean, they haven't found a terrorist anywhere legitimately.

Alan: Oh, yes they have.

Nathan: Have they?

Alan: Yes, it's all of us.

Nathan: Please tell me who?

Alan: It's all of us.

Nathan: Oh, yes! [Laughter]

Alan: It's all the civilian population, because we're all now the problem. They've told us, you know, one day you might wake up with terrorist thoughts and they want to give you annual psychiatric evaluations, to see if you could have the potential, and some of the eugenicists, the bioethics committees have said they might even find the gene that causes it; does that make you feel better?!

Nathan: Did you hear about Canada enhancing the recreation trails, spending \$20 million to enhance all the old railroad trails around Canada?

Nathan: That's right and - coincidentally - we have that new army reserves are being mobilised in Canada.

Alan: I read that whole article yesterday on the radio.

Nathan: Well, that must have been where I heard about it from then.

Alan: It gets around.

Nathan: It gets around!

Alan: It's amazing when you're broke, you can always afford these things though.

Nathan: When we're broke exactly and we're not broke either. So, good, that vaccination programme, I think I know quite a few military fellows who come back from Iraq, their urinating burns, when they ejaculate it burns, the women aren't happy with it.

Alan: They had articles in the papers here, just a few years ago, with Gulf War I and some of the women in Canada, were actually in the newspapers, their hair all fell out, their teeth got loose, it's very much like radiation poisoning; but, the thing is though: some also had never gone; they'd all got their shots to go but they hadn't left the country, they came down with it too.

Nathan: And a friend of mine, he's in the military, he had 15 shots, 10 were recorded on his medical whatever they do there and 5 were not; and he suspects those are the 5 that have caused him not to be able to differentiate between cold and hot. You see and he's having all kinds of -

Alan: I've talked to some of the US troops who have phoned me, they were told to take certain pills every day, the sergeant would ensure they swallowed them even, but they were never allowed to know what they actually were. It'll be experimental.

Nathan: Take care, Alan.

Thanks for calling. There's so much going on; so, from Hamish and myself, from Ontario, Canada: it's goodnight and may your god or your gods go with you.

Transcribed by Bill Scott.

Links to topics covered in the show:-

"Australians refused insurance because of poor genes" by Deborah Smith (smh.com.au) - March 10, 2009.

"Binyam blames UK for mistreatment" (news.bbc.co.uk) - March 13, 2009.

"State sovereignty must be altered in globalized era" by Richard Haass [President of Council on Foreign Relations] (taipeitimes.com) - Feb. 21, 2006.

"Primary schools give sex education to children as young as FIVE after the Alfie Patten case" (dailymail.co.uk) - March 10, 2009.

"IBM plans to get deep into the water business" AP (at msnbc.msn.com) - March 13, 2009.

"Inquiry calls over Iraq dossier" (news.bbc.co.uk) - March 12, 2009.